



Legislative Inquiry

Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License (APPEL)

December 2024

*Prepared in response to an inquiry submitted by
Representative Jefferson Moss (51st House District)*

SUMMARY

Context for legislative inquiry

This review was conducted for Representative Jefferson Moss (House District 51), who asked OPLR to conduct a short evaluation of the Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License (APPEL) to address the following questions:

1. Do the requirements of APPEL exceed minimum standards for licensure?
2. Is there too much variability across local education agencies' (LEA's) APPEL programs?
3. To what extent does teacher licensure under APPEL depart from traditional licensing approaches for other occupations?

Key findings

Adequacy of requirements: The main elements of APPEL seem appropriate for high quality educator preparation programs. It is hard to draw firm conclusions about APPEL's outcomes at this stage. Teacher retention is a highlight. Other measures (e.g., completion, candidate test scores) are mixed. There are some opportunities to improve teacher preparation via APPEL.

Challenges to requirements: APPEL is valued by LEAs, but ongoing change to APPEL is causing fatigue about change and implementation issues. Additionally, teacher licensing via APPEL is challenged by both the prescriptiveness of upcoming competency requirements and some remaining complexity in Utah's licensing structure (license areas and endorsements).

Variability between APPEL programs: There is variability between APPEL programs. This variability is justifiable for the benefits that decentralization brings, but it requires USBE to uphold program quality and has some implications for APPEL program resourcing.

Perspectives on professional teacher licensing: Teacher licensing differs from traditional licensing in several ways: potential overreliance on licensure to meet high professional standards, the role of employers (LEAs) in licensing-related activities, and allowing teachers both with and without a professional license to lead classrooms. Practical benefits from some of these practices may outweigh the issues.

Recommendations

OPLR recommends caution in acting. Its recommendations include (see page 11 for detail):

- Preserve APPEL and the licensing structure at this stage;
- Consider a delay in implementation of the new competence requirements;
- Encourage collaboration between USBE and APPEL programs on: value of any further changes; set of outcomes to be measured; if resource issues should be elevated;
- Consider the phasing of further simplification of the licensing structure in the future, including an OPLR review of educator licensing no earlier than 2027.

CONTEXT

Legislative inquiry

This review was conducted for Representative Jefferson Moss (House District 51), who asked OPLR to conduct a short evaluation of the Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License (APPEL) to address the following questions:

1. Do the requirements of APPEL exceed minimum standards for licensure?
2. Is there too much variability across local education agencies' APPEL programs?
3. To what extent does teacher licensure under APPEL depart from traditional licensing approaches for other occupations?

OPLR conducted a high-level review which included understanding the APPEL program and requirements, speaking with stakeholders (USBE licensing team, APPEL program directors, stakeholders in oversight roles), and connecting with several education policy experts.

APPEL

The Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License (APPEL) started in 2020 when Utah's teacher licensing structure and licensure pathways were simplified. APPEL evolved from prior alternative teacher preparation programs and aimed to strike a balance between consistent educator standards set by the Utah State Board of Education (USBE) and workforce flexibility at the local level. It allows Local Education Agencies (LEAs), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) and Utah-based alternative teacher preparation programs to operate their own APPEL programs under USBE's standards to meet their local schools' specific needs for teachers.¹

APPEL is targeted at people with a Bachelor's degree, who either want to enter the teaching profession (the majority of candidates), or who already have experience in K–12 or postsecondary teaching. In addition to a Bachelor's degree, APPEL candidates typically obtain an Associate Educator License (AEL) from USBE prior to joining a program.² Obtaining an AEL consists of a background check, review of educator ethics, meeting some initial content requirements for teaching either elementary or secondary subjects, and completing pedagogical coursework of 5-7 hours prior to leading a classroom. Candidates then work as the teacher of record while obtaining their Professional Educator License (PEL) with the support of a local APPEL program partnered with that candidate's school.

Once in an APPEL program, candidates follow an individualized professional learning plan (PLP) with the specific content and pedagogical knowledge and skills they still need based on

¹ See pages 12-15 and Appendix 1 of Utah Office of Professional Licensure Review report, *Licensing Reform for Utah Educators: A Case Study*, 2022 (OPLR 2022 report) and USBE website: <https://schools.utah.gov/licensing/appel>

² Most APPEL programs require an AEL, though it is not required in Board rule. APPEL candidates can work towards a PEL with an LEA-Specific license. See footnote 21 about the LEA-Specific license.

USBE's standards and each candidate's background and experience. APPEL programs typically offer multiple ways that a candidate can obtain or demonstrate knowledge and skills, including competency-based approaches. Interviews with APPEL program directors suggest that most candidates (those without a teaching background) opt for, and are encouraged to complete coursework so they can learn needed skills. Candidates are partnered with a mentor educator to help candidates with the clinical experience, competencies, and dispositions they must demonstrate in the classroom. Schools and LEAs have guidelines on the quantity and type of interactions a candidate has with their mentor. Candidates are evaluated by their school principal annually based on state guidelines and need a rating of "effective". At the end of the process, a candidate may be recommended for a PEL by their school and program. USBE's role is to set the standards and requirements for APPEL, approve programs, provide support to programs and monitor programs.³

APPEL meets numerous objectives. It tilts towards offering LEAs local flexibility and control. It offers recruitment options for schools that may face teaching shortages in certain areas, or that prioritize certain candidates, such as local candidates (in the case of rural schools) or alternative candidates (in the case of charter schools with distinct education models). It broadens the backgrounds of teachers in Utah by offering an on-ramp to candidates who may be mid-or late-career. It also provides an avenue for existing teachers to switch teaching tracks (e.g., elementary to middle school, or special education to regular class and vice-versa).

Today, APPEL comprises approximately 50 programs with approximately 2,000 candidates in the 2022-23 school year (compared with approximately 6,300 candidates in traditional teacher preparation programs). This is almost triple the number of APPEL candidates since 2020-21.⁴ Because APPEL candidates work towards a PEL while they teach in classrooms, their training is more applied than traditional teacher education. Approximately 60% are working towards a PEL in Secondary Education (including Career & Technical Education, CTE), approximately 30% towards a PEL in Elementary Education and approximately 10% towards a PEL in Special Education (which is out of scope for this review—that program is run centrally by USBE).⁵ Programs vary in size, the largest serves a consortium of public charter schools (representing almost 300 candidates in 2022-23), while others are run at a public school district level (ranging from as low as 10 to roughly 150 candidates) or individual school level (and may have fewer than 10 candidates).⁶

FINDINGS

Adequacy of APPEL requirements

Given its short review, OPLR did not assess in depth or benchmark the stringency or volume of standards APPEL candidates are being held to. The main elements of USBE's requirements do

³ USBE APPEL materials, interviews with USBE licensing team and APPEL program directors

⁴ USBE 2023 Utah Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Annual Report (USBE 2023 EPP Annual Report)

⁵ USBE 2023 EPP Annual Report

⁶ 2022-23 APPEL program enrolment data from USBE

not appear to exceed what education policy experts⁷ consider steps for licensure, nor what the Utah Legislature outlines in statute in its expectations about the quality of its teachers and educator preparation programs.

The Utah Legislature has set high expectations for the quality of teachers and their preparation due to the civic and intergenerational importance attributed to education. Per Utah Code 53E-6-103, “the high quality of teachers is absolutely essential to enhance student achievement and to assure educational excellence” and candidates for licensure should “meet high standards both as to qualifications and fitness for service as educators through quality recruitment and preservice programs”.⁸ USBE is directed to ensure educator preparation programs “meet or exceed generally recognized national standards for preparation of educators”, including “instruction in the science of reading”.⁹ USBE has also been charged with developing alternative strategies to teacher training that incorporate competency and prior learning, experiential learning and degree-agnostic qualifications.¹⁰ While not at odds with high standards, USBE needs to meet its mandate for high quality and also broaden avenues for candidates to enter the teaching profession that meet the workforce needs of schools and districts.

Based on a brief scan of best practices from conversations with several education policy experts, APPEL appears to contain the main elements of what a teacher preparation program should include. As noted above, APPEL’s main elements are a Bachelor’s degree, background check, educator ethics, and basic content and pedagogical knowledge before entering the classroom, followed by more thorough content and pedagogical knowledge/skills requirements and demonstrated classroom competencies/dispositions. Candidates are employed on a provisional employment contract while in an APPEL program, allowing schools to not renew contracts for candidates who do not meet the standards expected of them.

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions about APPEL’s outcomes due to its newness and shifting requirements as APPEL has evolved since 2020. USBE does report on completion rates, retention rates, and some assessment results, but complete data is not published on many smaller programs for privacy reasons.

Completion for eight large APPEL programs varied from approximately 40–100% of their enrolled candidates in 2022-23 (assuming candidates take three years to complete), with districts such as Canyons, Ogden and Granite at the higher end of that range. This compares with 90+% in traditional teacher preparation programs (assuming candidates take four years to complete).¹¹ This likely reflects many factors, including the newness of APPEL, significant enrollment growth in APPEL programs, some variability program to program and some candidate drop-out due to individual factors. An AEL lasts three years, however candidates can complete APPEL before this time.

⁷ OPLR spoke to several education policy experts, including at the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). See Reference section.

⁸ Utah Code 53E-6-103(2)(a)(ii) and (b)(i)

⁹ Utah Code 53E-6-302(3)(a) and (b)

¹⁰ Utah Code 53E-6-206(1)

¹¹ USBE 2023 EPP Annual Report

A tentative observation is that APPEL has contributed to improved retention of alternatively-prepared candidates. In 2021 Utah's five-year average teacher retention rate was approximately 50% for alternatively certified teachers versus approximately 60% for traditionally certified ones.¹² In comparison, of 71 APPEL completers in 2020-21, 86% were still working in a school district or charter school three years later compared to 59% in traditional teacher preparation programs.¹³

Test scores suggest that APPEL candidate skills are slightly lower than traditionally prepared candidates, although it is difficult to draw strong conclusions due to changing requirements and lack of data. Overall results from a final pedagogical assessment (the PPAT) were lower for APPEL than traditional teacher preparation programs, with an average score of 36 vs 41, and a lower percentage of candidates reaching the state-mandated passing score. However, the best performing APPEL programs met or exceeded results of traditional programs.¹⁴ Pedagogical performance assessments are no longer a requirement for licensure so it is not a data point that can be used going forward.¹⁵ There is no published data on Foundations of Reading scores for APPEL candidates. Literacy preparation assessment became a statutory requirement for Early Childhood and Elementary PELs in 2020 and it has been in a pilot phase. Other outcome measures are not available, such as the quality of evaluations for APPEL candidates relative to traditional teaching candidates, or the outcomes of students based on the preparation pathway of their teacher.

From the perspective of the several education policy experts OPLR spoke with, the quality of APPEL candidate preparation could be improved in a few ways. These suggestions are not OPLR recommendations but convey what some experts point to as potential improvements to APPEL's candidate preparation. The suggestions would need to be balanced with the disruption from further change to APPEL (See next section). They would also likely increase barriers for candidates and present implementation challenges for some programs. These suggestions include:

- Increasing ways to give candidates classroom experience before they become the teacher of record (e.g., by teaching a summer camp class, or offering gradual teaching opportunities);¹⁶
- Considering making Foundations of Reading a prerequisite for obtaining an AEL in Early Childhood or Elementary Education, or otherwise a requirement to complete within a candidate's first year. This is so students can benefit earlier from this training;¹⁷

¹² OPLR 2022 report using data from A Performance Audit of Teacher Retention Within Utah's Public Education System. (2021). [online] Salt Lake City, UT: State of Utah Office of the Legislative Auditor General.

¹³ Excludes WGU's 3-year retention rate of 24% per USBE 2023 EPP Annual Report. Five year retention data is not available.

¹⁴ USBE 2023 EPP Annual Report

¹⁵ House Bill 208 from the 2024 Utah General Session

¹⁶ National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). OPLR 2022 report also points to research suggesting benefits of intensive preparation.

¹⁷ NCTQ. Preparation for Foundations of Reading is mainly via study guides. Feedback from interviews suggests the LETRS coursework is good preparation for this test but can take up to two years to complete.

- Ensuring programs are sufficiently selective in recommending APPEL candidates during the first three years of their provisional experience as data suggests the first three to five years is when a teacher's aptitude is evident;¹⁸
- Measuring the effectiveness of APPEL programs to produce strong teachers and student outcomes in a more structured way.¹⁹

Challenges to APPEL requirements

Anecdotally, APPEL has the support of LEAs.²⁰ APPEL fills a need for teachers that isn't always met through recruiting teachers that already have a PEL. Programs value the flexibility APPEL offers. They also appreciate the support USBE provides.

At the same time, OPLR's interviews with APPEL program directors indicate there has been too much change in APPEL since the 2020 launch, and that the prescriptiveness of some requirements has become too great.

APPEL has continued to change since its inception in 2020. This is mainly due to USBE's interpretation and gradual implementation of statutory requirements (such as the introduction of the PPAT, introduction of Foundations of Reading requirement, shift to competency-based preparation approaches). It is also due to USBE's response to changes in statute (such as the repeal of the PPAT).

The current evolution of competency standards to meet guidance in statute is causing fatigue about change and implementation issues. These competency standards are for General Teacher Preparation and Elementary Education, effective September 1st 2025. OPLR heard clearly in its interviews the need for stability in APPEL requirements for at least the next five years. Program directors have grasped the current APPEL requirements, despite its changes, and are looking for a period of stability to focus on fine-tuning and measuring outcomes. Additionally, competency-based approaches are more difficult to implement because they require candidates to demonstrate a skill versus complete a task. The new changes require program directors to reevaluate the adequacy of their APPEL programs to ensure they align with each competency. An additional challenge is identifying the resources needed to vouch that candidates have demonstrated competencies under the new framework.

The introduction of new competency standards is also leading to criticisms that, in trying to meet its legislative mandate, USBE is becoming too prescriptive and expanding the scope of teacher licensure too far by articulating in detail every aspect of competency that a candidate needs to meet. Detailed competency standards within APPEL may also inhibit hiring and teacher preparation practices for charter schools, whose teacher preparation approaches do not fit exactly with all aspects of the competency framework. While charter schools can, and already

¹⁸ Chad Aldeman.

¹⁹ National Conference of State Legislatures, Education Research & Policy.

²⁰ Interviews with APPEL program directors

do, rely on LEA-Specific licenses²¹ (instead of APPEL) to hire educators to a greater degree than district schools, a PEL (achieved via APPEL) allows teachers to work more freely between schools, which is a benefit to the state overall.

Interviews with APPEL program directors also revealed complexity in the licensing structure that could be further streamlined. One example is to examine whether licenses can be broadened. The current license areas of Early Childhood (Pre K–3), Elementary (K–8) and Secondary (6–12) put constraints on schools' staffing options and may be contributing to some unneeded license complexity. A second area is endorsements. USBE rewrote endorsement requirements for Secondary Education recently and these now include multiple avenues to complete endorsements. However, there may still be areas for simplification, including whether pedagogy requirements could be shared across some endorsement areas, whether some endorsement requirements are overly stringent for that subject, such as PE, and if the competency-based approaches created for endorsements are being used successfully by candidates.

While APPEL could be optimized further based on some of the suggestions above, additional change could also be counterproductive based on earlier observations about the need for program stability.

Variability between APPEL programs

The decision to decentralize alternative teacher preparation through local APPEL programs is justifiable. However, it involves benefits and drawbacks, and it requires USBE to uphold program quality. It also raises questions about appropriate resourcing for APPEL programs.

Allowing local flexibility to meet USBE teacher prep standards through APPEL has numerous practical benefits. Programs can adapt how they meet USBE requirements to better fit how their LEA is organized and what their Boards and administrators want to emphasize in their districts or schools (e.g., Granite emphasizes the “Granite Way”). Flexibility enables innovation in school and teaching practices, which was the intent behind charter schools (e.g., American Prep Academy delivers their own APPEL coursework tailored to the teaching practices in their schools). LEAs can tailor teacher prep to individual needs of APPEL candidates, though this is easier for LEAs with more experience and/or resourcing (e.g., Canyons draws on four staff to support aspects of APPEL). APPEL also enables program modification without USBE being accountable for making (likely reasonable) exceptions to a centrally controlled process.

One downside to the greater flexibility is greater variability in program implementation and candidate experience. Some programs have more structure and resources than others, and some have more customization than others (e.g., several programs OPLR spoke to offer their own coursework, two programs required intensive summer training, etc), leading to different

²¹ LEA-Specific licenses are considered temporary and are issued by USBE at the request of LEAs. Similar to an AEL, candidates for LEA-Specific need to complete a background check, a review of educator ethics, and some basic pedagogical coursework. LEAs are supposed to disclose their hiring under LEA-Specific licenses and have development plans (PLPs) for candidates, including how candidates work towards a PEL. See: <https://schools.utah.gov/licensing/leaslicensing>

candidate experiences across programs. This variability is exacerbated by candidates entering APPEL programs with a range of experiences and needs, and participating in the program at different points in time since 2020 when different requirements were in place. Despite this variability and complexity, APPEL programs still require approval from USBE and operate under the same structure. It should be noted that variability also exists between traditional teacher preparation programs, and they likely have a more homogenous set of student backgrounds than APPEL, particularly at the Bachelor's level.

LEA reliance on APPEL also varies considerably by location and type of school. Districts such as Alpine, Nebo, and Cache County, with their geographic proximity to traditional teacher preparation programs at higher education institutions, rely far less on APPEL than, say, charter schools might. This is an argument in favor of local control as programs can adapt APPEL to meet their hiring needs and the expectations of their local parent and student bodies.

The choice for local control puts the onus on USBE to maintain consistent standards, processes and controls in a decentralized system. USBE seeks to do that through program approvals, monthly meetings with APPEL program directors, an annual APPEL leadership conference, program auditing and ad hoc support. USBE's audit practices were criticized in a 2022 internal audit report of licensing, in particular for lacking standard processes and controls. A related issue is USBE's reliance on the integrity of APPEL program directors to present a fair set of candidate files for USBE review.²² USBE is updating their audit process for APPEL to consider principles of continuous improvement like an accreditation process. OPLR has not had an opportunity to evaluate how USBE's oversight is evolving in response to critique.

Perspectives on professional teacher licensing

Teacher licensure stands out in several ways from licensing in other professional areas. The concerns, highlighted most notably in USBE's internal audit, are that high standards pursued through licensing drive unnecessary complexity, the involvement of LEAs has inhibited USBE's primary role as licensor, and the use of non-professional licenses for teachers in the classroom (AEL and LEA-Specific) undermines the value of the professional license (PEL). These concerns are valid, and there are opportunities for improvement, some of which USBE has already acted upon. However, the presence of these issues may also reflect pragmatic choices.

Teacher licensure is distinct for explicitly aspiring to embed the highest professional standards (as in Utah Code 53E-6-103) as opposed to simple 'consumer safety' standards. Typical occupational licensure is focused primarily on preventing harm to consumers—especially from professionals who work independently and would otherwise be unaccountable except through tort law or market mechanisms. Teacher licensure is different in that teachers are members of faculty in schools (public, charter or private), which are regulated, funded, or directly run by government or local entities. As employers, the state, LEAs, and schools have multiple ways to hold teachers accountable beyond licensure. Teacher preparation programs, school boards,

²² USBE Internal Audit Department, Licensing Audit 22-02 and interviews with APPEL program directors.

superintendents, and principals all have significant influence over teacher quality and student outcomes.

Teaching's focus on the highest professional standards in licensing may have resulted in overly prescriptive and complex teacher preparation and licensing (discussed above). The Legislature's and USBE's attempts to meet best practices (versus minimum standards) is understandable and laudable, but may be overweighting licensure versus other mechanisms (e.g., funding, hiring/firing decisions, professional development, performance evaluations).

An additional way in which teacher licensure is distinct is the extent to which employers (LEAs), have been involved in licensing-related activities, which inhibits USBE's primary role as licensor. Previously, LEAs recommended candidates for licensure and applicants had no direct role with USBE in their own application. In response to USBE internal audit feedback, USBE made rule changes to restore their role as licensor. However, LEAs are still heavily involved in activities related to licensure, such as hiring candidates in advance of licensure, recommending candidates for licensure, and overseeing teacher continuing education. This points to the importance of role clarity, even if the involvement of LEAs is maintained for practical reasons.

A further concern is that AEL and LEA-Specific licenses may undermine the value of the PEL by enabling associate-level and unlicensed teachers to lead classrooms, albeit on a defined basis. Utah has a high percentage of professionally licensed teachers relative to other states.²³ USBE tracks the number of teachers hired on an LEA-Specific license in schools, however the practice is under the direction of local school boards and is most prevalent at charter schools.²⁴ USBE presents data showing that teachers with a PEL outperform those with AEL or LEA, suggesting that a PEL has significance.²⁵ However, OPLR's review didn't unpack the extent to which teacher effectiveness is linked to license type versus other variables, such as experience teaching in a classroom (which varies by license type). Allowing non-professional licenses in teaching potentially questions the need for the higher PEL requirements. At the same time, it doesn't mean the PEL isn't valuable for setting standards or providing reassurance about baseline knowledge and skills to principals in hiring decisions. USBE has taken steps to bolster the PEL, for example by clarifying the AEL can be extended by two years but not renewed, and clarifying guidelines for LEA-Specific, to indicate these are temporary licenses. Allowing the AEL and LEA-Specific to coexist with the PEL can also be viewed as necessary to serve local workforce needs. It balances professional licensure standards with expanding avenues for alternative candidates and providing LEAs with workforce flexibility.

²³ Nearly 90% in 2023-24 compared with ~50% in California, ~60% in Arizona, >80% in Colorado and <90% in Idaho, based on USBE data and USBE report to Reps Moss and Thurston, November 2023

²⁴ USBE data on teacher licensure by LEA

²⁵ USBE presentation: Education Highlight: Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the issues identified in this report, OPLR recommends caution in acting:

- 1) Preserve APPEL and the licensing structure at this stage. There are areas for improvement in APPEL requirements and license complexity, but these can be addressed in collaboration with USBE and APPEL programs, weighing the value of changes with the value of stability (see 2., 3. and 4. below).
- 2) Consider a delay in implementation of the new competence requirements which are effective September 1st 2025 to a) better understand their intent, level of complexity and implications for APPEL programs, and b) assess whether the current level of specificity is required. This would inform how to better balance potential prescriptiveness from these requirements with APPEL program flexibility.
- 3) Encourage collaboration between USBE and APPEL programs to determine:
 - a) The value of further changes in APPEL program requirements based on some of the suggestions in this review (such as earlier, more intense preparation in teaching practices and/or training in teaching students to read).
 - b) The outcomes that should be measured to evaluate APPEL program success in a more structured way:
 - i) Outcomes could include teacher proficiency at the end of APPEL program completion, as well as student outcomes from those teachers, such as student growth measures and levels of student proficiency.
 - ii) Comparisons should include APPEL program performance over time, comparing performance between APPEL programs, and comparing performance between APPEL and other teacher preparation pathways.
 - c) The extent to which resourcing of APPEL programs is an issue that needs to be elevated (this requires a deeper evaluation of variability and its causes between APPEL programs, and what causes some APPEL candidates to not complete the program).
- 4) Consider further simplification of license areas and endorsements. Changes to license areas could wait until OPLR's annual review of education licensing (see 5. below) to provide stability, while endorsements could continue to be simplified.
- 5) Conduct OPLR review of education licensing no earlier than 2027, consistent with OPLR's suggestion in its 2022 report.
- 6) Encourage USBE to continue improvements to their licensing practices, role clarity with LEAs and relationship between license levels (PEL, AEL, LEA-Specific) as needed, based on 2022 USBE internal audit feedback on licensing.

REFERENCES

National Conference of State Legislatures. Recruiting, Preparing and Retaining Effective Educators: A Legislators' Guide, February 2023

National Council on Teacher quality resources on Reading Foundations, Clinical Practice

USBE administrative rules, particularly 277-303 Educator Preparation Programs and 277-304 Teacher Preparation Programs

USBE APPEL enrollment data by program 2022-23

USBE APPEL program documents

USBE Internal Audit Department, Licensing Audit 22-02

USBE presentation: Education Highlight: Alternative Pathway to Professional Educator License

USBE report to Reps Moss and Thurston on Utah Educator Shortage, November 2023

USBE teacher licensure data by LEA 2024-25

USBE Utah Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Annual Report 2023

USBE website: <https://schools.utah.gov/licensing/appel> and <https://schools.utah.gov/licensing/leaslicensing>

Utah Code 53E Public Education System, Chapter 6 Education Professional Licensure

Utah House Bill 208, Teacher Licensure Amendments, 2024 General Session

Utah Office of Professional Licensure Review (OPLR) report, *Licensing Reform for Utah Educators: A Case Study*, 2022

Stakeholder conversations

- Chad Aldeman, Founder of Read Not Guess
- APPEL programs:
 - Alpine School District
 - American Preparatory Academy
 - Cache County School District
 - Canyons School District
 - Granite School District
 - Nebo School District
 - Ogden School District

- Providence Hall Charter School
 - Central Utah Educational Services (CUES)
 - Southwest Educational Development Center (SEDC)
 - Utah Association of Public Charter Schools
- Molly Gold, National Conference of State Legislatures, Education Research & Policy
- Molly Hart, USBE Board member and Executive Director of Summit Academy
- Shannon Holston and Hannah Putnam, National Council on Teacher Quality, Policy & Research
- Dr Rich Nye, Senior Advisor of Education to Governor Spencer Cox
- USBE Licensing team